

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 30 03:14:06 1994
Date: Fri, 30 Dec 1994 01:42:05 -0600
Message-Id: <9412300736.AA20508@asterix.isoft.intranet.gr>
From: "PMD G.SIFAKIS" <pmdsif@isoft.intranet.gr>
Subject: 1995

May all the good people in this list and their families have a happy 1995.

George SV0KA

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 30 15:16:46 1994
Date: Fri, 30 Dec 1994 13:40:56 -0600
Message-Id: <199412301934.MAA29097@Freenet.HSC.Colorado.EDU>
From: al511@freenet.hsc.colorado.edu (Robert Neece)
Subject: Re: A Case For CW

Hugh Stegman writes:

>We need CW to keep some romance in this place, just like we need old trains
>and pipe organs.

Yes, we do.

And sailboats, and cameras that use film, and . . .
(But, I like CW best.)

--

73 de Bob, K0KR

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 30 11:26:18 1994
Date: Fri, 30 Dec 1994 09:49:47 -0600
Message-Id: <199412301547.AA07534@shore.shore.net>
From: Michael Crestohl <mc@shore.net>
Subject: A Christmas Visit - explanation!

Dan WA0JRD wrote:

> Cause Mike wrote:

>> > Hi BA folk:

>> >

>> > Hope you all had a nice Christmas.

> <stuff deleted BION!>

> Some nice fellows have now educated me and I'm hoping to hear this
>guy on the air someday! I dunno if the propagation on 75 will allow
>it, but it seems to me I've heard the east coast from time to time here

>in Nebraska,so we'll see.....interesting..

I guess I should explain. Some of the folks here are well acquainted with Tim WA1HLR, aka The Timtron. Jack W4PPT spent some time up in Maine and knows the lad well.

Jack and I like to swap Tales of the Tron off newsletter, but I guessed that most of the subscribers would know what it was about. Sorry for assuming that, it just seems that around here, "everyone" knows who Tim is. You may be able to hear him on 3885 when conditions are right. However, since his place was consumed by a fire of unknown origin his signal has been heard less often. He's been living and working in "sorry-excuse" (Syracuse) NY and living at the "Piss-Weak Hotel". It was nice to see Tim on Christmas.

> I'd still like to know about "Lick Me" and why it's \$21.00 per
>hour!!(i'm just trying to be humorous here fellas..but i'd really like
>to know.....<8-/....) 73 de Dan -- WA0JRD

I had mentioned to Jack that I had been offered a temp job in the computer department of a local area department store for the Xmas rush @ \$14.00 per hour. Monday was my last day @ time and a half or \$21.00 per hour. The name of the store is Lechmere, but it can easily be translated by someone of license (aren't we all licensed??) to Lech Mir which means "lick me" in German!

Hope this answers your questions and clears up some confusion!!

Happy New Year All!!!!

73,

Michael Crestohl KH6KD/W1

-/-Michael Crestohl KH6KD/W1/-----mc@shore.net-----

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 30 19:20:03 1994
Date: Fri, 30 Dec 1994 17:46:40 -0600
Message-Id: <Chameleon.4.01.941230154417.dgibbs@>
From: "R. Dennis Gibbs" <dgibbs@Rational.COM>
Subject: RE: Antenna Coupler

Hello everyone,

The message appended below has prompted me to ask a question I've been wanting to ask for a long time. How many of you out there are using antenna couplers such as the one below? My HF boatanchor receiver collection has grown to the point where it's very inconvenient to swap antennas via antenna switches or via manually swapping the cable. Also, it sure would be great to be able to use multiple receivers from the same antenna. However, I suppose what has prevented me from using an antenna coupler so far is the concern regarding performance. How much loss do these couplers cause by inserting them between the antenna and receiver? If the coupler has amplification circuitry in it (as I assume the one described below does), how much added noise does this create? Are there any other performance degradation aspects that I have not mentioned?

I can certainly see the added convenience of an antenna coupler, but if performance is degraded in any way significantly, I'd probably not bother getting one.

Are there additional model numbers other than the one below that anyone has used with great success?

Any war stories from those of you who have used these would be most welcome!

Best wishes to all, and Happy New Year,

Dennis Gibbs
dgibbs@rational.com

>
>Greetings from the Great Green North!
>
>I have recently purchased a CU 872A/U antenna coupler (made for the US Navy)
>that allows 8 receivers to be hooked up to it. It's a fine beast with 21
>tubes in it. My question is what type of male connectors should I be using to
>hook-up my receivers to the coupler? Better yet can someone suggest a
source
>for the male connectors. Any info appreciated. Hope that everyone had a
great
>Xmas and will have a good New Year.
>
>John Barnard
>
>

>

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 30 22:12:36 1994
Date: Fri, 30 Dec 1994 20:37:41 -0600
Message-Id: <ECUK3456.ECUK3506@mail.admin.wisc.edu>
From: TOM.A.ADAMS@mail.admin.wisc.edu
Subject: Antenna Couplers

to: boatanchors@ThePorch.com

Hello Dennis.

I've been using two Navy surplus antenna couplers for about 6 months now, and frankly I wonder how I've gotten along without 'em!

The receiver situation has gotten totally out of hand here, and SOMETHING had to be done. Two broadband antennas, fed thru couplers with 5 outputs each, finally made things work out well.

There MAY be a little degradation of receiver front end noise figure, but I haven't noticed anything dramatic. To my way of thinking tho, noise figure isn't a biggie in HF receivers, since the spectrum they cover is so damned noisy to begin with! Building a receiver that has a noise figure way below the atmospheric / galactic noise level is a bit pointless, but that's the case in virtually every HF receiver now in use, because that's where the state of the receiver art has been for many years. So it is with the front end of a receiver coupler; let's just say that the coupler brings overall noise figure of the system closer to the spectrum noise floor, but it's STILL well below it.

As long as your proposed antenna coupler has somewhere near unity gain (say +/- 3 DB) you won't have to sweat intermod from receiver front end overload; that's probably the biggest hazard with one of these boxes. Some couplers have a gain adjustment pot; if yours does, go easy on it.

BTW; helpful hint for all users with large numbers of receivers.

If you should encounter at some hamfest a section or two of video jack-field (and cords for same), GRAB THAT SUCKER!!! One of these critters with a multioutput antenna coupler will give you the most flexible antenna distribution system imaginable. With your coupler's inputs, antennas, and coupler outputs on the upper row of jacks, and your receiver antenna inputs connected to the lower row of jacks, it is a two second operation to connect any possible combination by sticking in patch cords. To make the system even better, the input of the coupler can be routed to a variety of antennas by a coaxial switch (see earlier message re. B+W closeout at H+R; I already placed an order to upgrade MY receiver rack!).

One comment re. jackfields; I wouldn't recommend using one of these to patch transmitters to various antennas. Jackfields were designed to handle 1 volt pk-pk video signals, and while you might well get away with patching QRP power levels, I figure that transmitting thru one of these is asking for trouble. Frankly, they're just too expensive and hard for the average ham to get to risk burning one up by transmitting thru it.

Mr. T.

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 30 12:50:23 1994
Date: Fri, 30 Dec 1994 11:16:04 -0600
Message-Id: <9412301709.AA07111@kali>
From: wallace@jericho.mc.com (Andy Wallace)
Subject: Drake List wanted

Hi!

Since my feed was down when the Holy Drake List was being formulated, I missed it. Would someone be kind enough to email it to me? (Gee, hope I don't get 200 copies.)

--Andy

(Yeah, still have to fix the hum in the 2-BQ path...)

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sat Dec 31 01:02:42 1994
Date: Fri, 30 Dec 1994 23:28:48 -0600
Message-Id: <v01510104ab2a9b70cbef@[128.83.204.32]>
From: bsn@fusion.ph.utexas.edu
Subject: HP 400D Manual

Was someone looking for manual for HP 400D VTVM? I thought I had a copy of one but couldn't put my hands on it until this evening.

Barry W5KH

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 30 21:06:45 1994
Date: Fri, 30 Dec 1994 19:33:30 -0600
Message-Id: <199412310132.AA08545@portal.chevron.com>
From: "Marcotte, T F (T" <TFMA@chevron.com>
Subject: Outage, re: R-390A census

FROM: Marcotte, T F (Tom)
DATE: 12/30/94 19:24

TO: OPEN ADDRESSING SERVI-OPENADDR

CC:

SUBJECT: Outage, re: R-390A census

PRIORITY:

ATTACHMENTS:

My university had an Internet outage during the last few days, so any contributions to the R-390A census from Dec 29 to about Jan 2 dropped off the planet.

If you sent me something, please resubmit to this address until Jan 2 (temporary only) to make sure it doesn't get left off of the list.

tfma@chevron.com

So far the contributions cover five manufacturers.

Thanks,
Tom n5off

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 30 17:29:39 1994
Date: Fri, 30 Dec 1994 15:53:56 -0600
Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.941230164828.13606A-1000000@access4.digex.net>
From: Tony Stalls <rstalls@access.digex.net>
Subject: R-390 Cabinet Wanted

Does anybody have one? I've found two for \$150 and \$200 respectively, but that's a bit much. When Fair Radio has them, they're \$75, but they're out at the moment.

73,

Tony
K4KY0

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 30 22:31:50 1994
Date: Fri, 30 Dec 1994 20:55:47 -0600
Message-Id: <516@ki5sl.ampr.org>
From: ki5sl@ki5sl.ampr.org (Rick_Blank)
Subject: Re: RE: Antenna Coupler

In message <Chameleon.4.01.941230154417.dgibbs@> dgibbs@rational.com writes:
>

> Hello everyone,
>
> The message appended below has prompted me to ask a question I've
> been wanting to ask for a long time. How many of you out there are
> using antenna couplers such as the one below? My HF boatanchor
> receiver collection has grown to the point where it's very inconvenient
> to swap antennas via antenna switches or via manually swapping the
> cable. Also, it sure would be great to be able to use multiple receivers from
> the same antenna. However, I suppose what has prevented me from
> using an antenna coupler so far is the concern regarding performance. How
> much loss do these couplers cause by inserting them between the antenna
> and receiver? If the coupler has amplification circuitry in it (as I assume the
> one described below does), how much added noise does this create? Are
> there any other performance degradation aspects that I have not mentioned?
>
> I can certainly see the added convenience of an antenna coupler, but if
> performance is degraded in any way significantly, I'd probably not bother
> getting one.
>
> Are there additional model numbers other than the one below that anyone
> has used with great success?
>
> Any war stories from those of you who have used these would be most
> welcome!
>
> Best wishes to all, and Happy New Year,
>
> Dennis Gibbs
> dgibbs@rational.com
>
> >
> >Greetings from the Great Green North!
> >
> >I have recently purchased a CU 872A/U antenna coupler (made for the US
> Navy)
> >that allows 8 receivers to be hooked up to it. It's a fine beast with 21
> >tubes in it. My question is what type of male connectors should I be using to
> >hook-up my receivers to the coupler? Better yet can someone suggest a
> source
> >for the male connectors. Any info appreciated. Hope that everyone had a
> great
> >Xmas and will have a good New Year.
> >
> >John Barnard

I use a CU-565, Westinghouse Type KM-2, antenna coupler made for
the USAF and it seems about the same as the one you mentioned with
a test meter with a switch to test B+ and 10 pairs of tubes, and

has "C" type connections on the back for 8 receivers...I replaced the "C" type connectors with SO-239's and BNC's...much, much easier than trying to source enough "C" type fittings...

I guess that I better describe the setup:

The part of the shack to the left of the computers is mostly new stuff, except for the C-Line, and to the right is the older stuff. I have a shelving unit that houses an HQ-180, a BC-614-I Speech Amplifier for the BC-610-I, a 32-V2, a Harmon-Kardon stereo rcvr for the 486, and, most importantly, the Johnson T-R switch. Next to the shelf unit is an equipment rack with a dual speaker panel at the top, the antenna multicoupler, a 51-J4, an R-390/URR, a Hammarlund SPC-10 SSB converter (hooked to the 390), a blank panel just right to stick a 390A or a R-388 or an SP-600 (whichever I get done first) and then a National Type CNA-49105 loudspeaker panel made for the Navy's RAS-5 radio equipment that I have a 10" coaxial speaker and 600 ohm transformer in, which in turn is connected to the SPC-10.

The Coax line for the old rigs comes from a distribution switch to my left and to the T-R switch. The receiver line goes to the antenna multicoupler and the Transmitter line goes to a selector switch for choosing between the 32-V2, the BC-610, the SR-150 or the SR-400A. I have a 12V power supply whose output is controlled by cascaded relays on the 32V and BC-610 that apply 12V to separate relays on the backs of the HQ-180, HQ-215, 51-J4, R-390, and SPC-10 to activate the muting circuits. Some receivers take voltage to mute and on those I use little surplus "wall wart" type power supplies for the muting voltage... Another coax line runs from the coupler around the room to the HRO-60T and NC-183D which one of these days I may set up with muting. I mostly use the two Nationals for SWL'ing or when I don't want to xmit...I think you get the basic gist of the setup here and it seems to work fine for me.

The Johnson T-R switch eliminates the use of a coaxial type relay in my installation and when I use the 2 Hallicrafter's SR rigs, protects the front end of the coupler....My couple had a set of high-pass filters that had a low cut-off of 2MHZ. I bypassed these (easily with BNC jumpers, no mods to do) so that I could use the receivers to listen to AM BC and lower.

As far as for noise, well, I don't really have any instruments to measure that, but, just empirically there isn't really enough to worry about...it works and allows me to play with my toys more, so, I like it!

I do have an Ameco model PT preamplifier that I can put in line

ahead of the coupler if I feel like I need more gain, it's tunable and this is a big help if you must use a preamp, but I feel like I rarely need it, so, I took it out of the line for now.

Hope this answers some of your questions!

73 and Happy New Year!
Rick Blank, KI5SL
ki5sl@sat.ampr.org
2223 Blanco Road
San Antonio, Texas 78212
end

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 30 18:50:47 1994
Date: Fri, 30 Dec 1994 17:17:23 -0600
Message-Id: <941230181555_2697910@aol.com>
From: JosephWP@aol.com
Subject: Re: Re: KWS-1 Mech Filter

Rick,

Thanks!

That's exactly the info that I needed.

73

Joseph Pinner
Lafayette, LA
KC5IJD

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 30 15:33:03 1994
Date: Fri, 30 Dec 1994 13:56:48 -0600
Message-Id: <Pine.ULT.3.91.941230114926.8086D-1000000@ohm.elee.calpoly.edu>
From: Cal Eustaquio <ceustaqu@ohm.elee.calpoly.edu>
Subject: Re: RE>Re- Ranger II/7027A mods

Scott:

Received your message and it was indeed helpful. I read someone else's reply to our messages and they suggested using the SOVTEK 5881's. Sounds like a good idea. I looked at the Johnson Ranger 1 and 2 mod xfrm part #'s and they are identical so at least in that part, I thought the 1614's and the 7027's were close. Also the pinouts were close but I think that some more experimentation is needed to confirm all this. I also got my idea from someone who was selling spare 6L6WTB's as subs for the 7027's at the back of the Nov 94 ER. So that will be interesting if anyone has

done the substitution for the tubes. Also, regarding the 7591's. I am also working to change them out to 6L6's in my tube Kenwood rcvr/amp. By the way, does anyone know of an audio glow-in-the-dark newgroup similar to the BA lists? I'd appreciate. 73's. Cal, N6KYR.

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 30 17:44:36 1994
Date: Fri, 30 Dec 1994 16:10:13 -0600
Message-Id: <9412310109.22624.AA@smrouter.AAC.COM>
From: Johnson_Dan@AAC.COM
Subject: Request help relettering a Hallicrafters S-38B

Greetings,

The FAQ says that stupid questions aren't out of line, so here goes. I'm restoring a Hallicrafters S-38B to go with an as-yet unrestored Echophone EC-1B. (Anyone have a widowed Echophone cabinet top? Mine is MIA.) Step one 1 has been its cabinet, which someone painted flat grey. I stripped it to metal with 3M Safest Stripper and sprayed the inside with barbeque flat black and the outside with brown Hammerite (hammered metal finish). Despite my being a registered klutz, the result is pleasing.

Would someone suggest good ways to relabel the controls? The original letters seemed to be some sort of laquer and were more difficult to remove than the rest of the paint. Taking a chance, I removed all of the control labels but left the model designation and Hallicrafters name at the top of the front face. These now show as a slight relief in the Hammerite.

So, specifically: (a) did I blow it already by removing the existing labels; (b) did I blow it by not removing the model and manufacturer names; (c) how might I relabel the controls and apply yellow-green to the names?

I have considered rub-on letters, but how would I fix them without marring the surrounding finish, and can they be had in white anyway? Hand-painted letters are (I think) out of the question. Do tiny stencils exist? What sort of paint might I use?

Please, someone help spare this radio from a possible search for clear Dymo tape.

One more thing - can anyone suggest a source for S-38/Echophone schematics? The radio with its original paper caps won't align. One cap connecting the power switch chassis to the main chassis is is a particularly bubbly candidate.

Thanks in advance and 73 from a BA newbie,

- Dan/KC4EWT, Herndon VA, johnson_dan@aac.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 30 20:02:08 1994
Date: Fri, 30 Dec 1994 18:24:33 -0600
Message-Id: <9412310023.AA07335@kali>
From: wallace@jericho.mc.com (Andy Wallace)
Subject: S-38B, 19" racks

###From: Tony Stalls <rstalls@access.digex.net>
###Subject: R-390 Cabinet Wanted

###Does anybody have one? I've found two for \$150 and \$200 respectively, but
###that's a bit much. When Fair Radio has them, they're \$75, but they're out
###at the moment.

Geez, I didn't even know they had them. Could you give me (us)
the part number? I assume these are "just the right size." Also, I
notice that they have some transit cases in the right dimensions for a
390 or variant. Has anyone tried these?

My company was tossing out a DEC VAX and associated peripherals,
and I grabbed one of the peri cabinets. Took out the tape drives, but I
still have to disassemble it to get it into my car! Anyway, this thing
is very sturdy and has 19" holes of course, which use Tinnerman nuts.
(They're unthreaded...gad, where do I get more T-nuts?!) So if you are
looking for a BA homebrew rack or something, you might want to hunt
around for used/old computer cabinets. I know that my last company
(Bull/Honeywell) sold zillions of systems in great 6' tall 19" racks.

###From: Johnson_Dan@aac.com
###Subject: Request help relettering a Hallicrafters S-38B

Well, Dan, I don't know if you've ruined things by repainting.
It sounds (in this case) that the silver paint already applied made
things such that a strip was necessary. However, someone here suggested
a way of stripping off the upper layer of paint where the fool hadn't
prepared the surface first...such as this. Rubbing alcohol?

Yes, you can get white transfer letters. As for making them
green, perhaps experiment with a green hi-liter over the unrubbed
letters on the sheet and see what comes close.

And let me know how the restoration goes: Santa brought me an
S-38B too! (Haven't cleaned it up or looked inside yet, but it looks

pretty clean.)

--Andy
(wallace@mc.com)

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 30 16:03:55 1994
Date: Fri, 30 Dec 1994 14:28:31 -0600
Message-Id: <Pine.ULT.3.91.941230115947.8086H@ohm.elee.calpoly.edu>
From: Cal Eustaquio <ceustaqu@ohm.elee.calpoly.edu>
Subject: SP-200 cabinet.

Hello BA enthusiasts:

Just a project I would like to comment on that I am doing right now. Someone in a previous BA posting said that one of the outer rings of Saturn comprised of lost SP-600 cabinets. Let's throw in some SP-200 cabinets too.

I recently got an excellent SP-200 cabinet for my X-mas present. I cleaned up the front panel using Turtlewax clearguard (an ER "hints and kinks"), used a permanent black marker to touch up the minor scuffs and chips (a BA "hints and kinks"), and am left with a cabinet that is close to the SP-200 but needed some mods. I asked for (in a previous listing) but haven't received a response for hardware for the cabinet so I am left to do some fabrication/rebuilding/ refinishing/modification of the cabinet. The cabinet appears to be a Bud box (although I understand that Prestige cabinets were used for some of the SP-600's too). The top is missing the lock hardware. Apparently it wasn't geared to use the ring latch that is common to the Bud boxes of that era. There are 11 drill holes at the side of the cabinet. The paint looks as though a kindergardener/tagger left their mark on it. It is missing the chrome trim in front! So this is what I'm doing to rectify the situation:

The cabinet underwent some metal modifications yesterday. The SP-200 uses a twin-lead antenna input. There was an interference fit of this antenna block that ran up against the back wall of the cabinet. Using a Greenlee square chassis punch, I carefully measured the dimensions of the antenna block and punched out the hole 1/8" oversized all around. The SP-200 also had three extra threaded holes to anchor the receiver from the back in addition to the front. These too were measure and drilled in the cabinet. The receiver now fits the 200 like the proverbial glove!

On refinishing. The cabinet is having those 11 extra holes welded and ground off. Both the inside and outside is being stripped using a combination of chemical stripping and sandblasting. All flashing from the holes and the punches were filed off. The finish that will be applied to the cabinet will be a black krinkle powdercoating.

On replacing the missing front panel trim. What makes the SP-200 cabinet attractive is the chromed trim with the twin red striped lines that run crosswise the front. The cabinet is missing these and my last effort to located these missing pieces will be from Bud or Prestige. If they don't have the answer, then I will proceed with plan B: fabricating my own! I have decided that I will use solid brass stock to replace the missing trim. The pieces will be radiused in the front to emulate the chrome trim style radius, then the pieces will be milled to accept the two red striped lines. The back will be drilled and tapped so that the trim can be mounted in the holes readily provided by the cabinet. When that is done, I will probably fill in the milled lines with high-temp red paint, polish the brass trim to a mirror finish, and then powdercoat the trim with clearcoating. The result should look just as good (or better) than the original stuff from Bud or Prestige. But that is a lot of work.

So, can anyone suggest or assist me in this "cabinet quest?" Thanks.
Cal, N6KYR